



March 2, 2012

TO: Mayor and Members of Council

FROM: Denise T. Roth, Interim City Manager *DR*

SUBJECT: Items for Your Information

Contact Center Feedback

Attached is the weekly report generated by our Contact Center for the week of February 20, 2012 – February 26, 2012.

Council Small Group Meetings

Attached is the report of all Small Group Meetings for the time period of February 23, 2012 through March 1, 2012, between City Staff and [more than two but less than five] Councilmembers.

March 6, 2012 Council Meeting

- Agenda #8: Change Order: Spry Street Sidewalks: Attached is a memorandum from City Engineer Ted Partrick, dated February 13, 2012, regarding a change order for the *Safe Routes to School* sidewalk construction project.
- Agenda #10: Change Order: Hornaday: Attached is a memorandum from City Engineer Ted Partrick, dated February 21, 2012, regarding a change order for the widening of the road and bridge project. Change order is in the amount of \$25, 622.
- Agenda #11 & #12: Change order: EECBG: Attached is a memorandum from Energy and Sustainability Manager Steve Randall, dated February 29, 2012, regarding two change orders for the MMOB Windows Project and the Sub-Metering Project.

Follow-ups from City Council Meetings

- Emergency Notification System: As a follow-up to a question from Councilmember Matheny, at the September 13, 2011, City Council meeting, attached is a memorandum from Information Technology Director Darryl Jones, dated March 1, 2012, regarding the options available for a state-of-art emergency notification system.
- Alternative Funding Options for HEAT: As a follow-up to a question from Councilmember Bellamy-Small, at the February 21, 2012, City Council meeting, attached is a memorandum from Transportation Director Adam Fischer, dated February 28, 2012, regarding funding options for the Higher Education Area Transit (HEAT) program, which is currently under negotiations.
- Fare Assistance for SCAT: As a follow-up to a question from Councilmember Abuzuaiter, at the February 21, 2012, City Council meeting, attached is a memorandum from Transportation Director Adam Fischer, dated February 29, 2012, regarding fare assistance for the Specialized Community Area Transportation (SCAT) riders.
- Recycling Processing Cost Comparison: As a follow-up to a request from Council, at the February 28, 2012, City Council Special meeting, attached is a memorandum from Field Operations Director Dale Wyrick, dated March 2, 2012, clarifying the proposed offering from ReCommunity concerning our recycling processing contract and the potential cost savings to the City.

Second Quarter Financial Update

Attached is the PowerPoint presentation on the General Fund Second Quarter Financial Update.

South Elm Urban Market

Attached is a memorandum from Special Events Manager Josh Sherrick, dated February 22, 2012, regarding the new South Elm Urban Market, which will open every Sunday from noon to 5pm, May 6th to November 25th.

Fair Housing Training Conference

Attached is a memorandum from Human Relations Director Dr. Anthony Wade, dated February 29, 2012, regarding the fair housing training conference on April 3, 2012, from 8am to 3pm at the Sheraton Four Seasons Hotel.

DTR/mm
Attachments

cc: Office of the City Manager
Global Media

**Public Affairs
Contact Center Weekly Report
Week of 2/20/12 - 2/26/12**

Contact Center

4024 calls answered this week

Top 5 calls by area

Water Resources

Balance Inquiry – 640
New Sign up – 225
General Info – 148
Cutoff Requests – 98
Sign up/Owners – 95

Field Operations

Holiday Schedule – 126
No Service/Garbage – 79
Bulk Guidelines – 71
Repair Can/Garbage – 67
HHW/Transfer – 58

All others

Police/Watch Operations – 224
Openings/Closings – 79
Courts/Sheriff – 79
Police Records – 48
Privilege License – 46

Comments

We received a total of 2 comments this week:

Executive – 1 comment:

- In opposition of the noise ordinance in the City of Greensboro, it will hurt many business owners. You've hurt this city enough through your high taxes. Businesses can't grow or expand. Shame on the City Council for making so many people want to leave what used to be a great town.

Transportation – 1 comment:

- Customer wants to thank the signal department for repairing the timing on the signals on E. Wendover going west. She states that the repair was done quickly and she just wanted to thank the crew.

Overall

Calls about privilege licenses remained steady last week. Callers were anxious to know if the City was closed on President's Day but were happy to find we were open and taking calls. Otherwise, we received the normal mix of calls last week.

SMALL GROUP MEETINGS

Date	Councilmember	Department / Person Contacted	Subject	Council Notification Date
February 23, 2012 to March 1, 2012	Mayor Perkins, N. Vaughan, N. Hoffman, J. Kee, Z. Matheny, M. Abuzuaiter	Escorted by GPD	Noise Ordinance: Decibel Readings	2-Mar-12



February 23, 2012

TO: Denise T. Roth, Interim City Manager

FROM: Ted Partrick, City Engineer

SUBJECT: Spry Street "Safe Routes to School" Sidewalk
Contract 2009-063
Change Order #1

Summary

The contract 2009-063 has cost over-runs that will require approval of a change order by City Council. An agenda memo is being prepared for the February 21, 2012, Council meeting as a change order for \$65,723. The sidewalk construction contract is complete and the final costs have been calculated.

Background

White Oak Construction Corporation, a North Carolina Licensed General Contractor, was awarded the contract 2009-063 for a "Safe Routes to School" sidewalk construction project by the City Manager on December 21, 2010. The contract was estimated by the engineering staff in the amount of \$253,107 using historical pricing data. It was awarded to the contractor in the amount of his bid, \$171,515. The work is now complete.

This contract included no contingency funds, per NCDOT grant funding restrictions. The NCDOT is reimbursing the City for 100% of the sidewalk construction and for the inspections of the construction. The inspections reimbursement is allowed up to an amount equal to 15% of the construction cost. Per the terms of the City's agreement with NCDOT, the City must make payments to the contractor before being reimbursed, so a change order to the contract is required.

The change order is the result of additional work approved by the NCDOT. The primary additional cost (\$54,179) is in altering driveways where the new sidewalks cross them. In neighborhoods with no planning for sidewalks, driveways are frequently too steep for people with disabilities to safely walk across. Sidewalks with more than a 2% slope from one edge to the other are too steep for wheelchairs and people with walking disabilities to safely use. The addition of a high-visibility crossing at Summit Avenue in front of the school added \$5,044 to the cost.

Additional costs on recent contracts have frequently been the results of achieving compliance with the many ADA requirements applied to City transportation facilities, primarily sidewalks and street crossings. A brief discussion of those requirements is attached. The methods to achieve compliance are evolving, both in the methods and in the extent of the work.

A third item concerns moving 16 water meters and one fire hydrant in the sidewalks at a total cost of \$11,150. This unanticipated field problem was discovered during construction. Water meters, especially when they are located along the edge of a sidewalk, frequently create trip hazards and maintenance problems as the sidewalks age.

THP

Attachment

cc: Michael Speedling – Assistant City Manager
Butch Simmons – Engineering & Inspections Department
Adam Fischer – Transportation Department

Attachment

Spry Street Sidewalk, Change Order #1

The following material is excerpted from the “Accessible Rights-of-Way: A Design Guide” by the U. S. Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, 1999.

*It is provided as a brief introduction to the complexity of the issue of accessibility and how to provide it to the “**maximum extent feasible**”. That term, in addition to the term “**technically infeasible**”, has historically resulted in disagreement and confusion over the extent that the City must go to when it adds sidewalks along existing streets*

Introduction

This design guide was developed by the U.S. Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (the Access Board) in collaboration with the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT)/Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to assist public works and transportation agencies covered by title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in designing and constructing public sidewalks and street crossings.

Chapter 2: Title II Requirements

Sections 2.2 Alterations to Developed Rights-of-Way

An alteration is a change that affects (or could affect) access to or usability of a facility or a part of a facility. If a covered entity alters an existing facility or part of a facility, the altered area must be accessible to and usable by people who have disabilities to the **maximum extent feasible** *[my emphasis added]*.

Alterations must follow the ADA Standards for Accessible Design unless compliance is **technically infeasible** *[my emphasis added]*. Where the nature of an existing facility makes it virtually impossible to comply with all of the accessibility standards applicable to planned alterations, any altered features of the facility that can be made accessible must be made accessible.

Additionally, because alterations to existing rights-of-way offer fewer opportunities to mitigate the effects of topography and to incorporate maneuvering space and other accessibility features, accessibility guidelines include less stringent technical criteria for some conditions, such as a steeper permitted slope for a curb ramp where it may be technically infeasible to meet new construction requirements. Alterations, however, may not be undertaken that have the effect of reducing existing levels of accessibility below the requirements for new construction.

Examples of alterations in rights-of-way construction include a downtown sidewalk improvement project, a roadway realignment or widening, or the addition of a sidewalk along an existing right-of-way. Where additional right-of-way is acquired for a roadway project, it is important to consider accessible sidewalk construction, where appropriate. Such right-of-way acquisitions may also offer opportunities to improve access to adjacent sites and existing facilities.

Some ADA compliance problems, and even court cases, have arisen from differing interpretations of the term "alteration." Many highway agencies consider the removal of a wearing surface and its replacement with a new thickness of paving as merely routine maintenance-part of the long-term maintenance program for a roadway-and, therefore, not an "alteration." The ADA definition of an alteration, however, is much broader. The DOJ title II implementing regulation (see 28 CFR §35.151) defines an alteration as a change that "...affects or could affect the usability of a facility or part of a facility." In *Kinney v. Yerusalim*, a Federal district appeals court decision held, "if a street is to be altered to make it more usable by the general public, it must also be made more usable for those with ambulatory disabilities." If resurfacing affects the usability of a street for motor vehicles (or for pedestrians at crosswalks), curb ramps must be included where pedestrian routes cross curbs or other barriers to use. Surface projects of more limited scope, such as spot patching, thin-coat sealing, reseating of disturbed curbing, restriping of existing markings in place, and similar efforts, could be considered as maintenance rather than alterations. FHWA policy states that agencies should plan to incorporate curb ramps on all resurfacing projects beyond normal maintenance where pedestrian routes exist.

The placement of benches, public telephones, or public toilets at specified locations within a developed streetscape or the addition of pedestrian signals at a street crossing should also be considered alterations requiring accessible features for those elements within the scope of the project.





February 21, 2012

TO: Michael Speedling, Assistant City Manager

FROM: Ted Partrick, City Engineer

SUBJECT: Hornaday Road and Bridge
Contract 2007-011
Change Order #1

Summary

The contract 2007-011 has cost over-runs that will require approval of a change order by City Council. An agenda memo is being prepared for the March 6, 2012, Council meeting as a change order for \$25,622. The road widening and bridge contract is complete and the final costs have been calculated.

Background

Dane Construction, Inc., a North Carolina Licensed General Contractor, was awarded the contract 2007-011 for the Hornaday Road and Bridge Construction Contract by the City Council on October 20, 2009. The contract was estimated by the engineering staff in the amount of \$11,652,590 using historical pricing data. It was awarded to the contractor in the amount of their bid, \$5,803,580. The project work is now complete.

The change order includes a portion of the asphalt price adjustments. The total cost of the asphalt adjustments is \$69,756.10 on a total of 430.3 tons of liquid asphalt. The increase was reduced by \$44,133 using credits from various other items to result in a net amount of \$25,622 on the change order.

The cost of the asphalt includes an unforeseen escalation in the terminal prices of asphalt in the summer of 2011. The contracts used by the City for roadway pavement include a long-standing fuel cost adjustment provision, which reduces the cost of the contractor's risk. The provision adjusts the payment to the contractor for asphalt in accordance with the cost of the asphalt at the time it is purchased. The cost of the asphalt exceeded the base price in the contract specifications by an average of \$162/ton over the price at the time the contract award.

THP

cc: Butch Simmons – Engineering & Inspections Department
Adam Fischer – Transportation Department



February 29, 2012

TO: Denise T. Roth, Interim City Manager

FROM: Steve Randall, Energy & Sustainability Manager

SUBJECT: Engineering & Inspections, EECBG Change Orders
Contract 2011-077 MMOB Windows Project - Change Order #1
Contract 2011-086 Sub-Metering Project - Change Order #1

Summary

The contracts 2011-086 and 2011-077 are on the March 6th Council agenda as change orders due to a change in available funding. Funding from other Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) projects is being re-allocated in order to meet the City's grant spending deadline. This will allow for additional EECBG grant-base funding for the Melvin Municipal Office Building (MMOB) windows and the sub-metering projects, which will be used to include additional work that was included in the original bids, but was not included in the original contracts due to funding limits at the time.

Contract 2011-077 MMOB Windows Project, Change Order #1 will allow the windows on the east side of the building to be included for an additional \$83,650. Contract 2011-086 Sub-Metering Project - Change Order #1 will allow for additional electrical sub-metering to be installed at Police District #3, the Kitchen Operations Center, and at the Justice Building (Metro 911) for an additional \$57,550.

Background

1. MMOB Windows Project

As part of the EECBG from the Department of Energy, Engineering & Inspections sponsored an MMOB Windows Replacement Project, which was approved and included in the list of funded projects. Duke Energy rebates that the City received during the Pepco Energy Savings Performance Contract are being utilized as well. Council approved a budget ordinance on September 13, 2011 permitting the department to utilize these funds for the MMOB windows replacement project. The goal of the project is to replace as much of the existing 40 year old single pane glass as possible in order to save energy, to reduce maintenance costs, and to upgrade the windows to last another 40 years.

This change order is grant funded, there is no budget impact. Funding for this contract is available from the EECBG formula grant fund, account number 221.2203.02.5413, in the amount of \$83,650.

2. Sub-Metering Project

As part of the City's EECBG formula grant from the Department of Energy, Engineering & Inspections sponsored a Sub-Metering Project, which was approved and included in the list of funded projects. The goal is to enable the department to efficiently and effectively analyze the HVAC system and equipment level energy usage data on a real-time basis. It will allow for the establishment for the city's baseline energy use to be used to develop a projected monthly budget; the identification of abnormalities and maintenance issues; the prioritization of additional savings opportunities; the calculation of energy, dollar and environmental savings; and for the verification of the savings from the Pepco energy savings performance contracts.

This change order is grant funded, there is no budget impact. Funding for this contract is available from the EECBG formula grant fund, account number 221.2203.02.5413, in the amount of \$57,550.

SMR

cc: Michael Speedling - Assistant City Manager
Butch Simmons - Engineering & Inspections Department
Butch Shumate - Engineering & Inspections Department
David Howell - Engineering & Inspections Department



March 1, 2012

TO: Denise T. Roth, Interim City Manager
FROM: Darryl Jones, Director, Information Technology
SUBJECT: Emergency Notification System

The Information Technology department has researched several options to consider for an Emergency Notification System (ENS). All solutions under consideration are state-of-the-art emergency notification systems to alert residents about life-threatening emergency conditions. Residents can receive emergency alerts via cell phone, e-mail, text message, or hearing impaired services. Residents can maintain their information on the subscriber's sign-up page.

The options under consideration are as follows:

- VoiceShot
 - Web based hosted system, residents would enroll online, does not offer text keyword to enroll
 - Pay as you use it, 12 cents a text (if you text 200,000 people it would cost \$24,000 as a one-time fee, plus \$10 a month, \$60 activation fee)
- Cooper Notification (RSAN Citizen Warning System)
 - Washington DC currently uses this system: <https://textalert.ema.dc.gov/register.php>
 - Alert multiple groups, networks, and devices from one web page
 - RSAN: Phone Calls, Voice Mails, Text, SMS Messaging
 - Residents would enroll by texting a keyword like: AlertGSO
 - Capability to launch alerts from SmartPhone through their mobile app
 - Estimated one-time cost \$250,000
- AMG Alerts
 - Residents would subscribe through their website. Does not offer text keyword to enroll
 - Turn-key hosted system with one stop website for subscribing and alerting.
 - \$5000 annually

Based on cost and the unknown subscriber rate, we recommend AMG Alerts. This will allow us to explore and evaluate the solution with a minimal investment. Staff will continue to work with the CMO on budget and implementation strategies in the development of an Emergency Notification System.

DJ



February 28, 2012

TO: Denise T. Roth, Interim City Manager

FROM: Adam Fischer, Director, Department of Transportation

SUBJECT: Alternative Funding Options for Higher Education Area Transit (HEAT)

Background

The Higher Education Area Transit (HEAT) program began in August 2006 as a partnership with seven colleges and universities in and around Greensboro. The original agreement called for the City to pay capital costs associated with bus purchases and for the participating colleges and universities to pay the operating costs of the new HEAT routes. Students would be allowed to board any bus by showing their ID cards or semester passes.

The City obtained a Federal grant to cover 80% of the operating costs over the first three years, sharply reducing the financial contribution of the schools. When this grant expired in 2009, GTA entered into a three (3) year contract where each participating school paid \$15 per student per semester to cover the operating cost of the HEAT routes beginning FY 2009-10. The Greensboro Transit Authority has established some new HEAT routes and adjusted existing routes in response to student requests and ridership patterns. GTA also credits \$100,000 annually to the HEAT program, which is the approximate amount of increased Federal aid resulting from additional hours of service and ridership, which the HEAT service contributes to the GTA system.

The next three-year contract (*currently under negotiations*) is scheduled to begin in August 2012. GTA's original proposal of an increase to \$20 per student per semester was met with concern on the part of some school partners. After analyzing various proposals to change some HEAT routes in order to reduce the operating costs, GTA identified a preferred plan that would increase the contribution of our partner schools to \$16.20 per student per semester in the coming year, rising to \$17.40 in the academic year 2014-15.

Alternative Funding Options

Are there other financing alternatives for HEAT service? The short answer is no. The program has always been based on a partnership with the colleges and universities. GTA does not have extra operating funds to support the HEAT service. Even if such funds were to become available, their use in support of HEAT (as opposed to broader improvements in GTA service) would raise reasonable questions among our current riders and the residents of Greensboro.

The GTCC experience offers a potential alternate model. GTCC is prohibited by State law from increasing local fees to their students. In August 2009, after the expiration of the Federal grant, GTCC and the GTA Board worked out an arrangement at the request of City Council. GTCC pays for six daily trips on Route 74 to the Jamestown campus, and a fixed number of one-way passes to get students from their homes to the Depot in the morning and back home in the afternoon. In exchange, GTA provides GTCC with HEAT passes valid ONLY on Route 74. Under this agreement, GTCC receives exactly what it pays for; GTCC students cannot use their HEAT passes on any other route.

GTA calculates the cost of HEAT service using the actual cost per revenue hour that we pay to our contractor plus 14.9% to cover maintenance and fuel costs. Some other transit agencies that offer similar services charge the "fully allocated" cost that includes a portion of fixed costs (e.g., for facilities, maintenance, equipment, and administrative costs). The current method of using "marginal" costs is appropriate and honors the spirit of the original agreement between the City and the college and university partners.

If you have questions or need additional information, please contact me at 373-2861 or Libby James at 373-2820.

AF/lj

cc: Michael Speedling, Assistant City Manager
Mike Dawkins, GTA Board Chair
Libby James, Public Transportation Manager



February 29, 2012

TO: Denise T. Roth, Interim City Manager

FROM: Adam Fischer, Director, Department of Transportation

SUBJECT: Fare Assistance for Specialized Community Area Transportation
(SCAT) Riders

Background

Federal regulations require that the American Disability Act (ADA) paratransit services be provided within $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile of existing fixed route service to persons with disabilities who cannot use regular fixed route services. Greensboro Transit Authority (GTA) is responsible for providing paratransit services to eligible persons during the times when GTA's fixed route services operate. In February 2005, the Greensboro Specialized Community Area Transportation (SCAT) ADA paratransit service was expanded through a local policy to include all areas of Greensboro, which extends well beyond the ADA requirement of $\frac{3}{4}$ mile of a fixed route. The expansion of the SCAT ADA paratransit service area has resulted in a tremendous increase in total operating cost while the Ad Valorem property tax assessment, which is primary funding source for the paratransit service, has not increased.

The cost per trip for the SCAT ADA paratransit service during FY 2011 showed that the average cost per passenger trip was approximately \$30.00, as compared to an average cost per passenger trip on the fixed route system of \$3.31. The average monthly cost to operate the GTA SCAT service is approximately \$419,000, or over \$5.0 million annually.

In order to offset the higher cost of providing the require ADA paratransit service, Federal Transit Authority (FTA) allows transit agencies to charge up to two (2) times the fixed route fare. In 2007, in response to concerns from SCAT customers, the GTA Board reduced the then \$2.00 SCAT fare to \$1.10, and adopted a policy of gradual fare increases for both the SCAT and Fixed Route services each year at \$.10 cents per year, took the current fare to \$1.30. In order to provide the same level of transit service, GTA's base fixed route fare and SCAT services fare will increase to \$1.50 beginning July 2, 2012. A recent peer analysis shows that fares within transit systems in North Carolina range from free at Chapel Hill Transit to \$4.00 at Triangle Transit Authority, with an average fare of \$1.90. All systems, with the exception of Chapel Hill and Winston Salem Transit Authority, have higher ADA paratransit fares than GTA and most charge twice the cash fare of their fixed route for the ADA service, as permitted by FTA.

Additional Subsidy Options

Currently, there are no viable options that would provide additional subsidies to offset operating costs and reduce costs to the GTA SCAT riders. GTA's prepaid fare media does offer discounts to SCAT users for multiple rides.

As noted in the study of GTA's SCAT service, conducted by AMMA Transit Planning last year, tighter compliance with the ADA can lead to improved services, and managing ADA trip demand is critical, especially since the City's revenue base is not growing as fast as the program grows in trip demand and service costs. However, the continuous growth in trip demand and operating costs far exceeds the City's revenues to support the SCAT service. Therefore, any additional subsidy to support SCAT service would require the City to seek additional revenue sources or to reduce the current level of SCAT service to coincide with the available City revenues to support the service.

If you have questions or need additional information, please contact me at 373-2861 or Libby James at 373-2820.

AF/lj

cc: Michael Speedling, Assistant City Manager
Mike Dawkins, GTA Board Chair
Libby James, Public Transportation Manager

Field Operations Department
City of Greensboro



March 2, 2012

TO: Denise T. Roth, Interim City Manager
FROM: D. Dale Wyrick, P.E., Director, Field Operations
SUBJECT: Recycling Processing Cost Comparison

At your request, I have assembled the attached table to better clarify the proposed offering from ReCommunity concerning our recycling processing contract and the potential cost savings to the City. Please note that the revenue share estimated in the proposed offering reflects actual commodity market conditions in 2011. That figure could vary based on actual market conditions.

Item	Current Contract	Proposed Offering
Processing Fee	(\$20/ton) = \$600,000 +/-	(\$0/ton) = \$0
Residue Disposal Fee	(\$41/ton) = \$ 400,000 +/-	(\$0/ton) = \$0
Total Fees	\$1,000,000 +/-	\$0
Revenue Share	(\$600,000)+/-	(\$600,000)+/-
Total Revenue	(\$600,000)+/-	(\$600,000)+/-
<i>Net Cost to City</i>	<i>\$400,000</i>	<i>(\$600,000)+/-</i>

As shown in the table above, the \$1,000,000 savings that I presented at the February 28, 2012, City Council Special meeting, equates to a \$400,000 expenditure savings and a \$600,000 revenue estimate.

If you have any questions concerning this information, I can be reached at 373-2783.

ddw



City of **GREENSBORO** *North Carolina*

General Fund 2nd Quarter Financial Update

February 28, 2012



Summary

- Through the Second Quarter of 2011, actual revenue collected compared to budget is meeting revenue projections
 - Total revenue collected (including transfers) of \$147.5 million is 58.4% of the amended General Fund budget of \$252.4 million
- Through the Second Quarter of 2011, expenditures and transfers equal \$125.8 million or 49.8% of budget



General Fund Overview- Revenues

FY 11-12 Budget by Revenue Category

	(in millions)	% Budget
Property Tax	\$143.1	56.7 %
Sales Tax	37.9	15.0
Utility Taxes	18.9	7.5
Beer & Wine/ABC	3.9	1.6
Privilege Licenses	3.2	1.3
Building Permit Fees	2.0	0.8
Waste/Trash Coll.	5.9	2.3
Other Revenue	24.0	9.5
Transfers In	8.2	3.2
Appropriated Fund Bal.	<u>5.3</u>	<u>2.1</u>
Total	\$252.4 million	100.0%

3



General Fund Overview- Revenues

- FY 11-12 Estimated Assessed Valuation of \$24.22 billion (0% growth rate)
 - Tax base is projected to increase by 0.74% or \$180 million in FY 11-12 due to increased property values in real, business personal and motor vehicle categories
 - AV growth averaged 2.8% over past five years, including 2008 annexation
 - Net of 2008 annexation, AV growth ave. 2.4% annually over past five years

4



General Fund Overview- Revenues

- Property tax revenue through December is \$110.3 million or 77.0% of budget of \$143.1 million
 - September 1 (1% payment discount date)
 - 94% projected collection by Jan. 5 due date
 - Estimated 98% collection rate for FY 11-12, comparable to past three fiscal years
 - Property tax revenue is projected to exceed the budget estimate by \$880,000

5



General Fund Overview- Revenues

- Sales tax revenue through December is \$10.5 million or 27.8% of budgeted amount of \$37.9 million
 - Received July-Sept. monthly distributions from the State (payments lag by 3 mos. after month earned)
 - Payments thru Dec. '11 of 27.8% were \$10.5 M compared to 25.3% or \$9.7 M thru Dec. '10
 - Baseline sales tax collections are tracking slightly ahead of projections
 - 1st qtr. revenue included the FY 11-12 sales tax hold harmless payment of \$815,000
 - Growth in sales tax collections in second half of year will depend on general economic improvement

6



General Fund Overview- Revenues

- Utility tax revenues through December are \$4.9 million or 25.8% of budgeted amount of \$18.9 million
 - Received 1st quarter revenue distribution from the State (payments lag by 3 months after quarter earned)
 - Payments thru Dec. '11 of 25.8% were \$4.9 M compared to 27.3% or \$5.0 M thru Dec. '10
 - 2nd, 3rd & 4th quarter payments due March, June & September 2012
 - Utility tax revenues are expected to be slightly below budget estimate based on a mild fall & winter

7



General Fund Overview- Revenues

- Beer & Wine tax revenue is budgeted at \$1.2 million
 - This annual payment is distributed by the State on May 31, 2012
 - This tax revenue is expected to meet budget estimate (revenue for the period April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012)

8



General Fund Overview- Revenues

- ABC Board Profit Distribution is \$663,872 or 24.31% of budgeted amount of \$2.73 million
 - 1st qtr. payment received – 2nd, 3rd & 4th quarter payments due February, May & August 2012
 - The ABC Board Profit Distribution has included a quarterly deduction since the last quarter of FY 06-07 to increase working capital and provide for future expansion & capital improvements; the deduction was reduced from \$100,000 to \$50,000 per qtr. in FY 11-12
 - Projected revenue of \$2.93 million was reduced by \$200,000 for a net tax pmt. budgeted at \$2.73 million
 - ABC revenue is expected to meet the budget estimate

9



General Fund Overview- Revenues

- Other Revenue Collections
 - Privilege Licenses – Business license revenue is projected to slightly exceed budgeted revenue of \$3.2 million. The addition of the Internet Sweepstakes Business License category resulted in \$325,000 in revenue (est. at \$200,000) offsetting a slight decline in all other license revenue.
 - Building Permit Fees – 6 months revenue of \$1.1 million is 53.6% of budget of \$2.0 million, with revenue 6.1% higher vs. FY 10-11; annual revenue is projected to meet or exceed budget
 - Waste/Trash Coll. Fees – 6 months revenue of \$3.1 million is 52.7% of budget of \$5.87 million, with revenue (2.7)% lower vs. FY 10-11; annual revenue is projected to meet or exceed budget
 - Other revenue – 6 months revenue of \$11.6 million is 48.4% of budget (includes Guilford County Library contribution of \$1.45million received December 2011); annual revenue is projected at 95.3% of budget with P&R revenues & Transp. reimbursement from State expected to be lower in the second half of the year

10



General Fund Overview- Expenditures

FY 11-12 Budget by Cost Category

	(in millions)	% Budget
Salaries	\$107.23	42.5%
Benefits	41.31	16.4
Maint. & Op.	76.03	30.1
Transf. Out	27.80	11.0
Capital Outlay	<u><.07</u>	<u><0.1</u>
Total	\$252.44 million	100.0%

11



General Fund Overview- Expenditures

- Salaries costs of \$53.21 million are 49.6% spent as a percent of budget of \$107.23 million
 - Total salaries costs for the first half of FY 11-12 are \$1.7 million, or 3.2% less than compared to the first half of FY 10-11
 - Total Full time equivalent (FTE) positions of 2,281; twelve fewer than FY 10-11
 - Six month combined Overtime/Premium Pay of \$1.36 million is \$223,400 below last year's six month figure (\$1.58 million)
 - Off duty expenses may still be impacted by unscheduled special events (e.g. presidential campaign visits, estimated costs \$250,000-\$300,000)

12



General Fund Overview- Expenditures

- Benefits costs for the first six months of FY 11-12 of \$23.39 million are comparable to the same time period in FY 10-11 (\$23.60 million)
 - Savings from the restructuring of longevity are beginning to be recognized in FY 11-12; payments posting through December were \$234,767, or 8% lower, than payments through December of FY 10-11
 - Health Insurance Contributions for the first half of the year are similar to last year; 15% increases in internal employer rates effective 1/1/12 will push year end totals to about 7% higher than FY 10-11
 - Workers' Compensation charges applied in October were about the same as the previous year (\$3.29 million)

13



General Fund Overview- Expenditures

- Maintenance and Operating (M&O) expenditures for the first six months of FY 11-12 of \$35.26 million are comparable to the same period in FY 10-11 (\$35.34 million)
 - M&O expenditures are approximately 46% spent for the first half of the year compared to 44% for the same period in FY 10-11
 - Gasoline and diesel fuel expenditures combined are 30% higher (\$2.34 million compared to \$1.81 million) during the first half of FY 11-12 as compared to the first half of FY 10-11
 - Year end projections for fuel are approximately \$4.6 million, or 6% of the M&O budget
 - January 2012 prices are 15-20% higher than prices were in January 2011

14



General Fund Overview- Expenditures

- M&O costs (cont'd)
 - Vehicle maintenance items account for approximately \$14.3 million, or 19%, of the total General Fund M&O budget
 - Actual costs to date are running about \$52,000 less than last year
 - Energy (heat and electricity) expenditures are down 5% for the first six months as compared to FY 10-11
 - Electrical consumption fell by 6.2%, or 856,000 kilowatt hours, for the six month period as compared to FY 10-11 with a similar reduction in weather-related cooling requirements
 - Natural gas consumption fell by 2%, or about 2,000 therms, for the six month period as compared to FY 10-11 with a similar reduction in weather-related heating requirements

15



General Fund Overview- Expenditures

- M&O costs (cont'd)
 - Renovation costs of facilities through six months are \$715,671 compared to \$487,078 through first six months of FY 10-11
 - Renovations to MMOB and the Police Headquarters
 - HVAC repairs and replacements at the Cultural Arts Center, Central Library and Historical Museum
 - Renovations to indoor fields and courts at the Sportsplex

16



FY 2011-2012 General Fund Year End Estimates

- Current Revenue Projections-\$246.5M - \$247.5M
- Current Expenditure Projections-\$246.4M - \$247.4M
- Potential Use of Fund Balance is estimated to be between -\$0.9M (revenues greater than expenditures) and \$1.1M (expenditures greater than revenues)

17



Other Funds

- Coliseum – Operating deficit during first half of FY 11-12 is approximately \$2.11 million, compared to \$1.04 million during the first half of FY 10-11
 - Due to rescheduled and additional events booked for the third and fourth quarter, the Coliseum projects to meet the operating deficit target of \$1.466 million
 - Coliseum also projects that the GAC will achieve its operating deficit target of \$400,000
- Hotel-Motel Occupancy – Room tax proceeds through Dec. 31 (5 months of revenue) are \$1.32 million, about \$73,000, or 6% higher than first two quarters of last year
- Solid Waste Management – Private tipping fee revenue for construction debris is down 34% (about \$229,000); private tipping fee revenue at the transfer station is down 4% (about \$55,000)

18



FY 2012-13 Budget Preparation

- Updated Deficit Projection- \$5.6 million
 - Further updated projections for major revenues such as sales tax and the potential need to increase fuel budgets beyond original projections have pushed the early total deficit projections to \$5.6 million.



February 22, 2012

TO: Denise T. Roth, Interim City Manager
FROM: Josh Sherrick, Special Event Manager
SUBJECT: South Elm Urban Market

The Special Events Office is happy to welcome the new South Elm Urban Market to the City of Greensboro Special Event scene. This event is a collaborative effort of several downtown organizations and businesses including Grassroots Productions Ltd, Action Greensboro, Downtown Greensboro, Inc. (DGI) and others.

The South Elm Urban Market will be a new Farmers Market operating on Sunday afternoons in Downtown Greensboro from May 6th to November 25th. It will take place in the Elm/McGee Surface Parking lot at 336-340 South Elm Street, across the street from the Green Bean Coffeehouse and directly adjacent to Design Archives. Hours of operation are from 12:00 pm – 5:00 pm every Sunday afternoon.

It is designed to serve, not only downtown residents, but also the citizens of Greater Greensboro. It will provide an anchor for Downtown Greensboro on Sunday afternoons and promote "stroll-ability" between all businesses in the area.

According to the organizers, their mission is to establish and maintain a well attended weekly market on the 300 Block of South Elm Street, Greensboro, NC that will provides a wide variety of high quality goods, focusing on local and NC grown produce and handmade goods, to area residents and to create a vibrant, interactive social environment downtown on Sunday afternoons that attracts visitors to downtown businesses.

Market information can be found at their website at <http://southelmurbanmarket.blogspot.com/>.

JS

**Human Relations Department
City of Greensboro**



February 29, 2012

TO: Denise T. Roth, Interim City Manager

FROM: Dr. Anthony Wade, Director, Human Relations

SUBJECT: IFYI – Fair Housing Training Conference

On Tuesday, April 3, 2012, during Fair Housing Month, the Human Relations Department will host a fair housing training conference from 8:00 am to 3:00 pm at the Sheraton Four Seasons Hotel in Greensboro, NC. Nationally and locally known experts will provide training on fair housing protections involving persons with disabilities and what local governments should be aware of, related to reasonable accommodations and modifications, as well as, immigrant - national origin issues related to housing.

Presenters confirmed are:

- Robert S. Ardinger, PhD, nationally recognized expert on civil rights issues for persons with disabilities and civil rights legislation
- George Williams, Director, Compliance Disability Rights Division for the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development
- Dr. Mark R. Sills Founder and past-Executive Director of Faith Action International House
- Dr. Stephen J. Sills, UNCG Associate Professor of Sociology

The training will be open to all including, but not limited to, property management professionals, affordable housing managers, realtors, public housing managers and staff, private owners of rental units, homeowner association board members, local ordinance enforcement, and intake personnel

The registration fee for the conference is \$35, which includes a continental breakfast and lunch. Individuals interested in attending the event may RSVP by calling (336) 373-2038 or visiting www.greensboro-nc.gov by going to the Human Relations Department site no later than March 27, 2012.

AW